

Remarks/Arguments

It appears, based upon the rejections in the Office Action, that an incorrect set of claims may have been examined. The above set of claims was submitted with this application and amended in the preliminary amendment submitted concurrently with the filing of this application. The preliminary amendment was entered as indicated by the Office Action. The above listing of claims is the correct claim set as submitted and as preliminarily amended.

The correct pending claims should be claims 1-10. Claims 1-10 stand rejected.

Claims 8 and 9 have been amended to clarify the subject matter. The amendment to claims 8 and 9 are supported, for example, by Figure 1.

Claims 11-13 have been added to more fully claim the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention. The new claims are fully supported by the original specification, for example Figures 1 and 2. No new matter is believed to be added by the new claims.

Objection to the Drawings

Figure 1 is objected to because the microprocessor and speakers have the same reference number: "1527". Applicants have also found in Figure 1 that the ROM and "2H" video processing have the same reference number "1529."

Applicants propose amending Figure 1 as shown on the attached replacement sheet of Figure 1. The proposed change amends the "speakers" reference number to 1537 and the "ROM" reference number to 1539.

Specification

The specification has been amended herein to be consistent with the changes to Figure 1. The "speakers" reference number is changed to 1537 and the "ROM" is changed to 1539. No new matter is entered.

**Rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Williams
(US Pat No 6,134,419)**

Applicants submit that for at least the reasons discussed below present claim 1 is not anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) by Williams.

To be anticipated by Williams, each and every element as set forth in claim 1 must be described, either expressly or inherently.

Applicants' claim 1 recites: "means for receiving an analog signal;" and "means for processing said analog signal to generate a digitized audio signal and a digitized video signal;" (emphasis added).

Williams fails to teach or suggest at least these features. Williams shows, in Fig. 8, elements 54 (tuner) and 56 (satellite decoder) receiving signals from a digital satellite system. The received digital signals are packets having a header and payload data. Fig. 8 also shows receiving a signal from a cable network 132. Williams decodes the cable network signal with a QAM demodulator. Williams does not describe or suggest receiving an analog signal and processing the analog signal to generate a digitized audio signal and a digitized video signal, as particularly claimed in applicants' claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted Williams does not anticipate applicants' claim 1.

Claim 8

Independent claim 8, although different from claim 1, recites similar distinguishing features as recited in claim 1. For example, receiving an analog signal and processing the analog signal to generate a digitized audio signal and a digitized video signal.

Applicants' essentially repeat the above arguments with respect to claim 8, and therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons it is respectfully submitted Williams fails to teach each and every claimed feature and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over William in view of Dean (US Pat No 5,963,261).

Applicants submit that for at least the reasons discussed below, present claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Williams and Dean. Dean is cited as teaching converting an interlace video format into a video signal having a progressive scan format or visa-versa.

However, Dean fails to teach or suggest the elements lacking in the teachings of Williams. For example, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest

receiving an analog signal and processing the analog signal to generate a digitized audio signal and a digitized video signal.

Because neither of Williams or Dean teaches or suggests all the claimed feature, the Office Action fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 2-7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over William as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Fujii (US Pat No 5,898,695).

Applicants submit that for at least the reasons discussed below, present dependent claims 2-7 are patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Williams and Fujii. Fujii is cited as teaching the concept of delaying the output audio signal.

However, Fujii fails to teach or suggest the elements lacking in the teachings of Williams. For example, receiving an analog signal and processing the analog signal to generate a digitized audio signal and a digitized video signal. Thus, the combination of references, Williams and Fujii fails to teach or suggest all the claimed feature. As the Office Action fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claim 10

Applicants' claim 10 recites: "further comprising the step of providing said audio output signal to a secondary audio processor." The references, Williams, Dean and Fujii, either individually or in combination fail to teach or even suggest such a feature.

Applicants' claim 10 recites a unique combination of features, where the suggestion and motivation for such a combination is not found in any of the prior art or generally known to those skilled in the art. A reference is requested which suggests such a feature and combination of features.

Conclusion

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited

Ser. No. 09/582,451
Internal Docket No. RCA88853

to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6813, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Deiss and
Mark Anderson.

By: 
Reitseng Lin
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,804
609/734-6813

THOMSON Licensing Inc.
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 5/18/07

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to [Mail Stop ??????], Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450 on:

5-18-07
Date

Karen Seabourgh
Administrator Name